Case 1:16-cr-00473-RA Document 44 Filed 08/01/17 Page 1 of 56 1

	H7BsPARs	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	v.	16 CR 473 (RA)
5	HAENA PARK,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		New York, N.Y. July 11, 2017
9		12:20 p.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. RONNIE ABRAMS,	
12		District Judge
13		District ouage
14	APPEARANCES	
15	JOON H. KIM	
16	Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York CHRISTINE MAGDO	
17	Assistant United States Attorne	еу
18	FEDERAL DEFENDER OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant	
19	BY: JULIA L. GATTO	
20	ALSO PRESENT: PAUL ROONEY, HSI Special Agent	
21	The state of the s	
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (Case called)

MS. MAGDO: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Assistant United States Attorney Christine Magdo on behalf of the government.

With me at counsel table is HSI Special Agent Paul Rooney.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. GATTO: Good morning, your Honor. Federal Defenders of New York by Julia Gatto for Ms. Park.

THE COURT: This matter is on for sentencing,

United States against Park. Ms. Park pled guilty in January to
commodities fraud. In connection with today's proceeding, I
reviewed the following submissions: The presentence
investigation report dated June 20, including the
recommendation and addendum; Ms. Park's sentencing memorandum
dated June 27 with the accompanying exhibits, as well as the
reply letter dated July 10; the government's sentencing
memorandum dated July 5, also with accompanying exhibits and a
reply letter dated July 10; and I also have read all of the
victim impact statements submitted. There are 11 or 12.

With the one today, Ms. Magdo, is that the twelfth one?

In any event, I have read all of them, which I understand represent 18 victims and their dependents. I have also read the victim's statements attached, of course, to

Ms. Park's sentencing memorandum, and I recognize that those 1 2 are victims as well. 3 MS. GATTO: Just a note for the record, there was 4 one victim letter that was duplicated in the e-mail that was 5 sent. That letter appears twice. 6 THE COURT: Right. I have received two copies of a 7 few things because I received part of them in the government's submission dated yesterday and I had read all of those already. 8 9 But in any event, I have read them all. 10 I'll note later in the proceeding, but I'm happy to 11 hear from any victim who would like to be heard today. Just to 12 be clear, have the parties received each of these submissions 13 and has everything been filed on ECF even if it is in redacted 14 form? 15 MS. MAGDO: From the government, yes. 16 MS. GATTO: From the defense, yes. 17 18 Probation Office. 19

THE COURT: Let's begin by discussing the presentence report, which is a report prepared by the United States

Ms. Gatto, have you reviewed the presentence report and discussed it with your client?

> MS. GATTO: I have, your Honor.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you have any objection to it?

MS. GATTO: No, your Honor. No factual objections.

Ms. Park, have you read the presentence THE COURT:

report and had an opportunity to discuss it with your attorney?

2

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

3

4

THE COURT: Ms. Magdo, does the government have any objections to the presentence report?

5

MS. MAGDO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT:

6

7

findings in the report. The presentence report will be made a

All right. The court adopts the factual

8

part of the record in this matter and placed under seal. If an

9

appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the

10

sealed report without further application to the court.

11

in January, we discussed the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. As

Ms. Park, you remember, I'm sure, when you pled guilty

1213

you know, they are a set of rules published by the United

14

States Sentencing Commission in order to guide judges when they

15

impose sentence. Although at one time they were mandatory,

16

meaning judges were required to follow them, they are no longer binding. Nonetheless, judges must consider them in determining

1718

an appropriate sentence, and thus, must ensure that they have

19

properly computed the guidelines range.

20

Am I correct that the parties agree, consistent with the plea agreement, with the guidelines calculation in the

2122

presentence report pursuant to which Ms. Park is facing a

Yes, your Honor.

23

guidelines range of 108 to 120 months?

MS. GATTO:

24

MS. MAGDO: Yes, your Honor.

25

THE COURT: Based on the parties' agreement and my independent evaluation of the sentencing guidelines, I accept the guidelines calculation in the presentence report. I find that Ms. Park's offense level is 31, her criminal history category is I, and her recommended guideline sentence is 108 to 120.

As I said a moment ago, that range is only advisory. Courts may impose a sentence outside of that range based on one of two concepts, a departure or a variance. A departure allows for a sentence outside of the advisory range based on some provision in the guidelines themselves. In the plea agreement, both parties agree that no departure from the guidelines range was warranted. Nonetheless, I have considered whether there is an appropriate basis for departure from the advisory range within the guideline system. While recognizing I have the authority to depart, I don't find any grounds warranting a departure under the guidelines. I do, though, also, of course, have the power to impose a non-guideline sentence based on what we call a variance, which I understand the defendant is seeking.

With that, I'll hear first from the government or any victims that would like to be heard.

MS. MAGDO: May I inquire as to whether there are any victims, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, of course.

Would you like to be heard today?

MR. GRANT: Yes, please.

THE COURT: Please come up to the podium and state your name for the record, and I'm happy to hear anything you would like to say today, sir.

MR. GRANT: Your Honor, thank you for allowing me time to speak. My name is Ryan Grant. You have before you, among all those letters, not one but two from me; one in my capacity as a victim and one from my perspective as somebody who has watched Haena over the past year come to terms with her crime. So I will not repeat what I have written there.

I understand, although I obviously have not yet heard them today, that the U.S. Attorney is asking for a strict sentencing because of the severe impact that Haena's fraud has had on the victims. I fully recognize that some victims are very upset and want to lock her up and throw away the key.

I can appreciate that desire for I, too, am upset. My wife and I lost \$400,000 that represented most of what we had saved for my three boys' education and for our own retirement. And, even worse, I was personally betrayed by somebody I consider a sister. But I came here as a victim to say that, although the U.S. Attorney's office may speak for some victims with regard to sentencing, they do not speak for me. In fact, they did not ask me. And I know they do not speak for at least 12 other people who signed the same letter as I did to say

2.2

that, as victims, as people who were deeply affected by Haena's crime, it will only increase our pain if she is sent to prison.

That is not because we want her to get off easy.

Still less, because we are all closely related, some who signed that letter are friends of friends, though I am her brother—in—law. Rather, it is because we want Haena to face what she has done and walk the difficult and narrow road to redeem her life and build her integrity for much longer than 108 to 120 months. And we do not see that prison serves that purpose in her particular circumstances. We would rather see this court supervise a robust combination of counseling, significant community service time, and financial restitution to the extent possible.

As this hearing has approached, I have been asking myself if this request for mercy and alternative sentencing is in truth what the U.S. Attorney would claim it is, letting Haena off the hook, letting her get away with her crime. Yet, I can't quite place my finger on what she would be away with. She never benefited financially from this crime, never appropriated the money for her own use, never lived any differently than she has for the 20 years she's lived in New York.

What she did was hide her losses and increase her stakes out of fear and pride, out of a misguided and desperate attempt to save her reputation and the appearance of success.

I am not excusing that by any means. Far from it. But what she hoped to get away with, her reputation, has already been completely and irreparably smashed.

She now faces the long road to rebuild her character, her relationships, and I wrote in my personal letter some of the first steps that I have seen her take down that road. But she will never again regain her reputation, never outlive the public shame that her deeds have brought down upon her.

So I entreat you in your sentencing to consider that form of judgment that already hangs over Haena, that loss of what she valued and tried to preserve, and thus, to lend more weight to the nobler aspirations of our justice system, to encourage the penitent to responsibility and restitution.

Those nobler aspirations depend upon the belief that all criminals are, in fact, still human, people who need to go on living and choosing to do right, whatever they have done in the past. My understanding of the U.S. Attorney's position is that the wishes of these 13 victims who are asking you for clemency are invalid because we are too close to Haena.

Because everyone is, at least, a friend of a relative of an in-law, although I believe that applies to almost all the victims. Because we are somehow blind to our own losses because of this connection. If you'll forgive me, even in the these serious proceedings, as a husband of a divorce lawyer, I am amused by the apparent belief that all families stick

1 to

together when large amounts of money are involved.

I propose, instead, that the problem is the opposite; not that we are too close, but the prosecution is too far.

They have taken Haena's terrible mistake and, from a distance, without true knowledge, have built a monster out of her, by imputing to her motives she did not have, making assumptions about her lifestyle not backed up by facts, and presuming that nothing but a cage can contain her unrepentant malice.

If that were true, then we could only lament our inability to lock away this monster for life, for longer than ten years. But if Haena is still a person, a person who has started doing what is in her power to reckon with and redress her crime, then I plead with you to assist her in that effort with more effective methods than a cage. Please see her as a person.

Thank you for listening.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Would any other victims like to speak today?

Yes, sir. You can come forward and please state your name.

MR. HAM: Your Honor, my name is Jacob Ham. My parents and I were victims of the crime. My parents lost their retirement and the money that was left for my inheritance. Not much, maybe two, 300,000. I can't recall. I am also her husband, and I became her husband --

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. HAM: I proposed to her after I learned of the crime. I have known her for 14 years, and I have lived with her for 10 years, and I have not been away from her for more than a week at a time. So I, of all people, know her the best. And what I know is that Haena's mistake is so profoundly human. It is not an act of criminal mastermind, whose intentions were from the start to manipulate or deceive people for the sake of her own self gain. It was the act of someone trying desperately to try to care for those she loved with the ability that led her to incredible accomplishments.

I thought so long and hard, I thought so much about what it was like for her to set off on this path, and I can only imagine that what I would have done if I had lost my own sister's money and the money that she would have needed to raise her own family, and if all I had to do was to just do the thing that I had been doing for the past seven years with enormous success, and then to — and that was just to trade money, and she had been doing — she had been trading hundreds of millions of dollars on a daily basis for a fund that started with millions and turned into a multi-billion dollar fund, then I can only imagine that many of us would make the same decision to just do the thing that we are trained at and excelled at for so long.

I completely reject the idea that Haena has

intentionally used her Harvard degree and resume to lure people. I think those are empty trappings of success. They represent something extremely real about her, which is that she has never known failure and overcome every obstacle in her path. Her crime was not of deception, it was an unwaivering belief in her ability to make things right.

How could someone not have such confidence if they were able to do what Haena has done, come to the U.S. at the age of 13 without speaking any English, learning English while she is going to high school, and then graduate valedictorian of her school, go to Harvard, get picked up by Goldman Sachs with just a psychology degree. That is what I have, by the way, so I know it is not that much of a big deal. Get plucked by her boss and friend who is here, who launched the hedge fund together. It's an incredible story.

I saw this belief and determination every day in action since I've known her. I have never seen anyone who is more capable of driving herself to focus and work. And it was this drive that inspired me to accomplish what I have done in my life and apply for a federal grant to serve traumatized children.

When she traded and worked the way she did for so long, she never had a full night's rest. She had to wake up at the start of every market from Hong Kong, London to the U.S., and she even slept with an iPad propped up in front of her

face, just a few inches from her face because she can't see very far. She had all these tiny little alarms that I couldn't make sense on, and it would beep throughout the night to wake her up. She was so focused, she wouldn't eat or move from her desk. And I would come home and beg her to, like, take a break.

And with all her medical conditions, it was just the worst thing she could have done for herself. The cost to her body was so tremendous. There are so many days when she would just collapse with fatigue or illness and lie in bed for days on end or be exposed to random cleaning products or just the heat from the son or dirt from the street or just, like, the wrong food or just, like, too much stress and she would just blow up like a balloon. Her immune system was so weak and she was so reactive to nearly everything. She breaks out in hives and swells so badly, her eyes would nearly shut, and her lips would get so swollen that her lips would just tear from how big they were getting.

There were all these scary times, whenever the swelling would travel down her face into her throat and lungs, and I would have to run to the bathroom to get the EpiPen. And she would just grab it and stab it into her thighs, and we would have to wait for 30 minutes. And she would sit there just wheezing, waiting for the EpiPen to kick in, and I would be so afraid.

It's been much better for the past couple years because she has found this new medicine called Xolair that she has to go to a doctor and have a monthly injection and they have to sit and watch to make sure that she doesn't go into anaphylaxis just because of the injection itself. And since that time, she hasn't had to use an EpiPen, but it doesn't last very long. And even within, like, three weeks before the next monthly injection happens, she starts to get hives again and get red and splotchy. We have to be careful about what she is exposed to.

Even with the Xolair, her immune system is still compromised and she will catch every cold, every infection there is. So anytime she flies, she gets a cold. If I come home with just a scratchy throat, then she'll have the worst cold ever and she will be laid out in bed for a week.

I can't imagine what it is going to be like for her if she has to go to prison with her immune system compromised the way it is. We live in such a controlled environment now with an Army of specialists caring for her and in prison, she'll have reactions to everything and catch every infection. I have nightmares about her dying in prison going into anaphylaxis.

I am the only one who really can appreciate Haena's intentions and know how truly vulnerable her body is. I'm the only one who has seen it. I have seen her work for 14 hours straight, and I'm the only one there to help nurse her when

she's sick.

Everyone else just sees her when she is healthy. The only thing they've ever seen of the illness is when she is not there. She doesn't show up for things. Ask anyone how many times she flakes out on appointments. It is not because she doesn't want to go, it is because she is just too sick to come.

I can also testify to the fact that she did not lead a lavish lifestyle. Yes, her personal spending was much greater than I can afford on my salary of a psychologist, but her spending was never extreme. And it was modest in comparison to the other people that she knew in finance. They had six-figure watches on their wrists, they had luxury cars, talked about buying summer homes Upstate.

And we haven't even vacationed in the past few years. She hasn't vacationed for seven years since leaving the Fortress. We only started to travel because I personally begged her to. She only took two days off a year, and I felt like we needed a break. And we had met these friends who love to travel, and they would invite us. It became the right opportunity for us to to finally take time off. Even when we traveled, she took a laptop and two extra monitors with her, and she would stay at least three to five hours in the hotel room trading. She never took a break.

I also want to testify to the fact that every friendship that she built over the years have been sincere, and

I know that because these people were my friends too, and we used to talk about them a lot and talk fondly of them. And today, I see the pain and the loss in her face when we can't talk about them anymore, because we think about the loss that we've experienced.

Your Honor, Haena is not a monster. She is all too human like the rest of us. She loves her friends and family. She tried their best to get them, even if that meant covering up mistakes while trying desperately to make things right. I would have never been able to forgive her or marry her or share the responsibility of raising a child together if I had any doubt that she would be not be a loving mother and an amazing influence on our unborn son.

In fact, I hope our son is more like her than me. It would be an utter travesty if her character and humility were done, denied or destroyed by the prosecution and by those who are blinded by range and retribution.

I want to remind you that the majority of victims who have contacted the court have not asked for retribution, but rather restitution and restoration.

I beg you for mercy today because I truly fear for Haena's life if she goes to prison. More than anything, I beg you for your objectivity and clarity. I hope you see through the false characterization and see the remarkable person Haena is to both us, the victims, but also to her.

Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Would any other victims like to be heard today?

Would the government like to be heard?

MS. MAGDO: Yes, please.

Your Honor, the defendant's husband and brother-in-law are certainly entitled to express their views and any suggestion to the contrary is not true. As is the suggestion by Mr. Ryan that the government did not ask me for my opinion, as the court is well aware, our victim witness coordinator sends letters to all victims asking for their input, including Mr. Grant. So I would like to speak to the court on behalf of the other victims. The other victims who are not speaking today, but who have written letters, who are too devastated, too humiliated, and too distraught to stand up here and address the court today.

For more than six years, the defendant engaged in a massive scheme to defraud more than 40 people of more than \$23 million by falsely holding herself out as a successful Wall Street trader and investment advisor. In truth, she was nothing more than a con artist and her purported investments were nothing more than frauds.

Like many similarly situated defendants, Park may not have set out with the intention to steal from her victims, but like all those other criminals whose good intentions turn bad,

she made daily decisions to continue to lie, to deceive, and to steal. The harm she caused was not some abstract harm to the market or to anonymous individuals she had never met.

On the contrary, Park knew her victims very well.

They were her friends, the families of her friends, her colleagues, her own relatives. Park carried out this scheme for more than six years knowing full well that the money her victims entrusted to her represented their entire life savings or close to it.

Park's victims included an elderly individual whose retirement savings she wiped out, immigrants who had spent decades working multiple jobs to achieve the American dream, and parents who have scrimped and saved for their children's education. And then there is the wheelchair-bound triple amputee from whom she stole \$4 million, money that he had received as a result of the terrible accident that rendered him so severely disabled. As he put it, "She was on a mission to wipe me clean of every dollar." As another victim wrote, "This was not extra money."

I would like to address a couple points made in the defense submissions and that are raised again in the victim statements. There is a suggestion that there was no self-enrichment on the part of the defendant in committing these crimes. The defendant writes, "The defense objects to the government's assertion that she used her victim's money to

enrich herself and maintain her lifestyle." But I have handed up to the court and also to defense counsel something that was produced a long time ago in discovery, which is a memorandum of the defendant's post-arrest statement. I would like to point out to the court what she herself says on this topic after her arrest.

If you would turn to page seven, in the first full paragraph.

THE COURT: I'm just going to take this as Court Exhibit 1.

MS. MAGDO: Please. Thank you.

Park estimates that she paid approximately 250,000 to \$300,000 per year in bills to include legal bills, office space, and other bills. Park did not have a formal process for personal withdrawals for herself, but estimates that she pays herself a salary of approximately \$300,000 for living expenses. Park takes approximately \$25,000 per month for living expenses. Park pays the bills and her living expenses from the investor funds.

And to corroborate that, we can turn to Government Exhibit 1, which was submitted under seal with the government's initial sentencing submission. This is a schedule of her two bank accounts that she maintained through the period of the fraud. We can see on the very first page, the first line, that the opening balance in her bank account on December 5, 2009,

was \$16,000. This is after she was separated from her last legitimate employment.

Further, on page four of Court Exhibit 1, in the middle of the second full paragraph, Park herself admits that, "all large wires into Park's personal and business bank accounts represented investor funds."

What did she do with those investor funds? There is no dispute that she paid her rent, bought her parents a house and a Lexus, and spent money on herself. This is not uncorroborated. This is supported by both the bank account records and the statements of numerous victims, who say that she stayed in fancy hotels, traveled first class, went on shopping sprees, and was a frequent visitor to a high-end spa where each night costs close to \$2,000. This is corroborated by the more than \$400,000 in credit card payments that are made from these two bank accounts, which are scheduled out and which consists of investor funds. That \$400,000 in credit card payments is separate from the rent, the mortgage, and the car payments that she was also making.

One of the victims said that her spending habits were "modest compared to other people in finance." Well, from the period of 2009 to 2016, the defendant was not working in finance. She was defrauding people. So that is not an apt comparison.

I would also like to say something in response to

defendant's attempts to favorably compare this case to the case of Andrew Caspersen. While the actual loss in that case was greater, approximately \$36 million, I think it bears pointing out that \$25 million of that actual loss was born by a multi-billion dollar hedge fund, and the additional \$50 million in attempted loss was also going to come from a multi-billion dollar hedge fund. In that case, the actual loss to individuals was approximately half of the loss that Ms. Park inflicted on her victims.

In that case as well, Mr. Caspersen had two very young children. His scheme lasted for a fraction of the time that Park's did. Park also has aggravating factors, such as when the NFA came to do an audit of her in the spring of 2016, she repeatedly lied to them. She denied, for example, that she managed any third-party money or distributed any promotional material. The very purpose of the NFA is to protect investors from this type of fraud.

Perhaps most significantly, not a single one of the Caspersen victims suffered a significant financial hardship. In contrast, in this case, the court has received letters from at least 18 victims in which they describe their not only significant, but extraordinary finance hardship suffered as a result of Park's crimes, including the loss of life savings, the loss of retirement accounts that will force them to postpone retirement, and the loss of \$4 million that was

intended to pay for the medical and living expenses of a severely disabled individual.

In no event, the government submits, should Park be sentenced to less than four years' imprisonment to which Caspersen, that Caspersen is currently serving and, in fact, is significantly longer sentence is warranted here. That, your Honor, is because Ms. Park's victims will never be made whole. They will not be made whole financially and they will not be made whole psychologically.

In this case, every dollar that Park stole was money that her victims had worked for and saved. It wasn't just money that she stole. She stole decades of hard work, of diligent savings, of sacrifice. She took away their American dream. To quote from a couple letters, she robbed them of "the previous decade that we worked and sacrificed to save money and the next decade at least that we will need to recover."

"A good portion of the results of my life's work in pursuing the American dream."

"Countless 60- and 70-hour work weeks."

"A big portion of the stability that I worked incredibly hard to build over 53 years of my working life."

She has destroyed the "financial security for the next generation."

"The sum total of my savings that I had pain-stakingly collected, as well as over \$100,000 that I borrowed against my

retirement."

"The majority of the earnings that I have saved up for over 20 years."

"My entire cash savings, including all the money I was saving in retirement. I had diligently saved for nearly 20 years."

"My life savings, which amounted to just over \$3 million."

The psychological harm that the defendant caused to her victims is similarly overwhelming. As has already been discussed, the individuals Park targeted including her close friends, former classmates, and her relatives. Often those victims would refer others with whom they had a trusted relationship to Park.

As one victim, who had been a close friend with Park, put it, "With her Harvard education and intentionally show-casing of great wealth, she intentionally preyed on victims and that connections to others in a shocking incomprehensible masterful destruction of people's entire life savings; people who included older retired couples, couples with children under the age of six and a paraplegic."

Another couple wrote, "Park took the money after meeting our children, holding them, and telling us how lovely they are."

A couple with two children that had known Park for

years and from whom Park stole \$2.2 million wrote, "Park is not a simple thief. She is a serial liar who preyed on friends, family, associates and strangers. Her crime has "changed the way we think about people and our trust in people, not to mention the division it has created within our family due to taking responsibility for this horrific situation. I am unable to look at things the same way ever again."

"She preyed on the closest of relationships and those that could least afford to lose their life savings."

Park could have admitted her failures early on and lessened the loss to the first victims, but she chose not to do so, and preyed on innocence until the very end.

Another victim writes, "For me, the financial loss, while significant and tremendously impactful, has paled in comparison to the deep traumatic grieve and loss I have experienced as a result of being lied to and betrayed for years."

A victim who has known Park for nearly 20 years and who considered Park a member of our family. A woman who "unvetted all of her liquid cash savings and even liquidated her 401K," and who was told by Park, that was more like a sister to her than a friend wrote, "not only did I lose all of my savings, but I accepted a lesser-paying position following Park's advice. She advised me to accept the position because I no longer needed to save for retirement. She assured me that

my money would continue to grow in her fund, and that even with the salary cut, I could probably retire by age 50. Instead of knowing that my retirement is secure, I have to begin saving all over again with greatly reduced flexible income. My family and I are emotionally and financially devastated by the betrayal of someone that we considered to be a beloved member of our family. I am not certain how I will ever recover."

Your Honor, against this backdrop of financial and emotional devastation of this serious elaborate, long-running fraud, the defendant presents no credible or persuasive mitigating factors. There is no claim of economic hardship. There is no claim that the defendant didn't know what she was doing was wrong. There is no addiction or mental illness. There is no coercion or pressure from a coconspirator. There is nothing.

The only thing the defendant comes up with are her health issues, but these are a distraction. As your Honor is well aware, the BOP deals every day and cares for severely ill individuals.

THE COURT: Let me just ask about that. I mean, I read in your letter about who you've spoken to in the BOP, but have you really outlined each of her medical conditions and assured that they can take care of each of them?

MS. MAGDO: Yes, your Honor. In fact, I should have mentioned this. I submitted to the BOP the defendant's

unredacted submission, which alleges and sets forth each of the conditions, her medications, the affidavit of Mr. Philip Weiss, and that is what they were considering when they gave me this assessment.

Initially, when the probation officer had spoken with the BOP, he had only a more general sense of what her ailments are. But when I spoke to the BOP, I had given them the defendant's submission in its entirety, and they have no doubt that her conditions can be managed while she is incarcerated.

THE COURT: The idea is that she would likely be housed at the Federal Medical Center Carswell in Fort Worth, Texas.

MS. MAGDO: Yes. While BOP can't make a designation before the defendant is actually sentenced, that is their belief, at this point, is that is where she would be designated.

THE COURT: Among other things, they can monitor the brain aneurysm?

MS. MAGDO: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MS. MAGDO: Your Honor, in closing, I would just like to read a couple excerpts from a letter submitted by the man from whom Park stole the largest sum of money, \$4 million.

Judge Abrams, the letter begins, "The money that Park stole from me was not money that I had inherited from rich

parents. It was money that cost my flesh and bones. It was money that was supposed to cover my medical expenses and cost of living after a medical mistake in 2003 caused me to lose my two legs, my right hand, my hearing, and the function of my kidneys. In addition, I lost the use of most of my joints, experience cardiac arrhythmias, have had 24 surgical operations, more than eight years of slow recovery and physical therapy. I also endure chronic pain and have a lost list of medications, including immunosuppressant medications after my kidney transplant surgery. Park convinced me that I needed to grow my money so it could last me until old age."

The victim describes how Park befriended him, gained his trust over time, and created in him the fear that another economic collapse was coming and that his money was only safe if invested with her.

He concludes, "I don't know if I will ever get closure. The devastation she created is not just financial, it is physical, emotional, spiritual and psychological. It is indescribable. It is insurmountable."

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Gatto, would you like to be heard?

MS. GATTO: I would. Thank you, your Honor.

I would like to start out by acknowledging the people who are here to support Ms. Park. Some of them we have heard

from in really poignant speeches, but also Mr. Stevens is here in the front in a wheelchair. He is the individual, the founder of the community service organization that Ms. Park has devoted over 1,000 hours to. You know from my letter that she's saved that organization from basically extinction, and now they are poised to get millions of dollars in grant funding.

Mr.Novogratz is here also. That is Ms. Park's former employer at Fortress. He was the managing director there. He is also her current employer now. He wrote a very moving letter. We have heard from some of the victims, and there are other victims here of family. Ms. Park's parents are here, Ms. Park's sister is here, and a dear friend of Ms. Park is also here.

I also want to talk about the victims. The government spent most of its time talking about the victims, and I too want to do that, because I think there is really no dispute, your Honor, that the victims' voices voiced here by the prosecutor are real. The loss here, I agree with the prosecutor, is less about finances and more about emotion, what those finances relate to.

THE COURT: It's both.

MS. GATTO: Emotionally, yes. I think that is right. It is both.

The offense is egregious, your Honor. It is a long

period of time of lies, deceits, omissions. It involved a lot of money. But really, what I submit is the most tragic -- and there are lots of tragic dimensions to this case -- but is that these people were people who Haena did and continue to care deeply about. In that tragic dimension, your Honor, I think there is value to the court, because what you're hearing from some, not all, but some victims who are so close to Haena is their journey of forgiveness because they know Haena and because they can understand the real complexity of the motivations of this crime. It is something that I just don't think we can dismiss.

It is true, Caspersen had a gambling addiction. I am not saying she has a gambling addiction. I am not saying there was financial desperation, but the motivation here is complicated. And it is, as Mr. Ham said, very human. It is a lifetime of family pressure, cultural pressure, internal pressure that this woman had on her. I am not suggesting that this is going to bring comfort to the victims who lost their life savings.

THE COURT: Who took out a mortgage for the home for the very point of giving money when she knew full well was all based on a lie, that she was failing, that she knew that there were people's life savings.

MS. GATTO: Absolutely. I am not suggesting that it makes that pain, whether financial or emotional, less, but what

I am suggesting is, on the spectrum of offenses, the motivation has to be evaluated if we are imposing a sentence about culpability.

The tragic thing here is that Haena put this incredible pressure on herself. Again, I don't find this as an excuse, I think it is an explanation, one that the court has to looking at if we are going to really sentence the person who is before this court. She put this incredible pressure on herself. At the same time, she had so much confidence in herself. I think that that is the crime here.

The hubris in thinking, I am not going to lose these people's

money, I am not going to lose these people's money, that is how a fundamentally good person can do what Haena did. That is how she is able to lie to the people she loves. That is how Haena can allow people to take out mortgages on their homes and do all of these devastating things financially, because Haena has done nothing but overcome obstacles in her entire life since sixteen, and Haena thought she was going to do that. Haena wanted to do that. Haena's entire life, since she came to this country, has been doing that.

Again, your Honor, I am not saying that this excuses the conduct, and I am not saying that there should be no punishment for the conduct, but I think it is a dimension, a tragic dimension, that can't be so easily overlooked. The

government lists comparable defendants, and I say that with air quotes, including an individual who committed a Ponzi scheme where he purchased an island on Nova Scotia with the proceeds.

I, again, am not suggesting that Haena lived like a monk during this period, but Haena's motivation, Haena's driving force was not financial gain. It is something that makes this case unlike, by really a million light years, the cases the government is asking this court to rely on.

Your Honor, her motivations, her demonstrated remorse, her commitment to community service, her poor health, her pregnancy, her ability and desire to make restitution, all of these things are fundamentally important in making a decision about what is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

You're really not hearing the government talk about those things. We have a sentencing system in place, punishment, a voice to some of the victims. This is all part of it. But the court has to ask itself the question, does a jail sentence, a lengthy jail sentence or any jail sentence serve those objectives in the most sufficient, without being greater than necessary?

THE COURT: If you think I give a sentence of home detention, what kind of deterrent message am I sending?

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, specific and general.

THE COURT: Let's talk about general.

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, the deterrence here has

already, the message to the public has already been sent. There is plenty of studies that show this, especially in white-collar crime. The arrest, the loss, the collateral consequences send a message. That is actually --

THE COURT: They send a message to her. It may affect specific deterrence. With respect to general, you think that is sufficient?

MS. GATTO: I do, your Honor. I definitely think it is a very strong message. Is it sufficient? I do think so.

But plus, your Honor, I'm not asking her to get off scot-free.

I spent a lot of time, a lot of time thinking about what the right sentence is. This is for me, and I wouldn't be surprised for the court too, one of the hardest sentencing recommendations I have had to make.

THE COURT: This is one of the hardest sentencings that I have had to impose.

MS. GATTO: I am not surprised by that. I think the guidelines don't offer us guidance, your Honor. I think there might be a temptation that we can't take to say the guidelines are -- I don't mean to be flippant -- the guidelines are crazy. Let's cut it by 50 percent. Let's cut it by 75 percent. That accounts for the mitigation and all of that. That is not really right too.

What I did and what I am asking the court to do is methodically go through think 3553, as it is clear that the

court is doing. Your question about general deterrence is exactly what I would ask the court to do. Go through each one of them.

Your Honor, because of general deterrence and punishment, I am not asking for probation. That is where I spent all of my time. I am asking for a year and a half of house arrest, and that is what I thought of as an alternative to incarceration. What we are really proposing, what I really think is the only thing that is true to the statute, all of that statute, is some alternative to incarceration. A year and a half under house arrest, I have never seen a year and a half of house arrest. The longest house arrest sentence I have seen imposed in a very serious case was nine months. That is why I doubled it. I doubled it to a year and a half.

We are open to all alternatives to incarceration to make it as punitive, as loud of a message to the public as possible, while sparing her from incarceration, which is accomplishing nothing here.

THE COURT: This is a crime she committed every day for six years against 40 people, and she lost over \$23 million. And your proposal is she should stay at home?

MS. GATTO: Yes, a prisoner in her own home. I can see that, at the front of my submission, it is an extraordinary request. I didn't originally arrive at this sentence this way. I told you it took me months. I recognize how crazy it is to

ask for house arrest in the case where the losses are over \$20 million.

I'll talk about that later with respect to your argument regarding the fraud guidelines. This is not a case where there was one loss, there was one fraudulent loan for a high loss amount. This was every day for six years leading up to that loss amount.

MS. GATTO: Yes. Your Honor, I thought Mr. Ham really articulated something that I couldn't articulate. Every day of those six years, on one side there certainly lies — and I'm not at all suggesting otherwise — but on the other side is working herself to the bone, desperate to try to get this money back thinking, based on her life's —

THE COURT: Taking more money from new people.

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Knowing that she has lost everything so far.

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: New people, right? New people with life savings, with hopes of donating to children, grandchildren, medical needs.

MS. GATTO: Yes, your Honor. It is devastating to them. It is devastating and it is worthy of punishment, but I go back to what I say. We have to account somewhat for what is

going on in her mind. It is the same reason --

THE COURT: I agree, we do. That is a relevant factor. I don't disagree with that.

I think why someone commits a crime is relevant, among other things. It will help determine if they are likely to recidivate in the future. And if they are doing it for greed or to help a loved one, I think that matters.

MS. GATTO: Again, we are focusing only on -- it is certainly an important focus, the devastation to the victims, the need for retribution for those victims and the need for punishment at the expense of the other factors. I wonder, really, what putting her in jail for X number of months, whatever it is, the victims may have some emotional closure for that. The punishment will be sent there.

But what we're actually doing is we are going against other factors, including restitution. If we are going to talk about the victims, we should.

THE COURT: How much money is she making now? I know she is working.

MS. GATTO: She made \$15,000 in three months, your Honor. Her health, as you know, she had brain surgery in the interim. There was a period of time where she was getting back on her feet. In three months, she earned \$15,000. She earns \$100 an hour doing research for Mr. Novagratz's media company. That \$15,000 is all \$15,000. This isn't a case where I'm

saying, your Honor, my client will agree to 10 percent of the salary, 15 percent of her salary. That is every penny.

Her and her husband are living off of his salary. She is doing everything she can. Now, \$15,000, it's a drop in the bucket when it is \$23 million. But if the government got its way and put her in jail for nine years, if she is lucky enough to be in the UNICOR program, she will earn 23 cents an hour. Those nine years, that is half a million dollars.

THE COURT: That is true for every white-collar defendant, right? That is like saying no one should go to jail, stay out and make money to pay restitution.

MS. GATTO: That may be true, your Honor, for other defendants that have the ability, but rarely, certainly in my practice, I have never seen someone not only with the ability to make restitution, but the desire, really, the need to make restitution.

I mentioned this in my sentencing submission. From the day I met Ms. Park, all she has talked about is what can I do to put some pool of money together. So the home that she bought for her parents, which she purchased with the proceeds from her legitimate salary of Fortress where she was earning \$1 million, she discussed this. I said, you know, that money, that home was purchased with legitimate proceeds. You had considerable savings when this started. There is an argument that the mortgage payments were paid from yours.

She was very sloppy, your Honor. Everything is all mixed up. So whether I would prevail or not, Haena would not hear of it. Haena said no, that home I am going to sell. Not only do we agree to forfeit it. This is really unusual, the government will tell you, she put it on --

THE COURT: It is.

MS. GATTO: She put it on the mark. She found the buyer. The first buyer fell through. She found another buyer. The money went immediately in the car. The car was purchased for her parents with money from Fortress while at Fortress. We agreed to forfeit it. The marshals went to the parents' house and drove the car away. That is another \$15,000 in the fund.

So yes, lots of people are smart who commit crimes and lots of people can say I can find a job no problem. How many times do you have an individual who says, I am going to get a job, right? She has got a brain aneurysm, she is pregnant, she is suffering from major depressive disorder, and she goes out there and she says, Can somebody give me a job? And because of who she is, Mr. Novagratz gave her a job.

I found his portion -- I highlighted it. I am not going to read all the letters again. The court has read them.

But I highlighted them in my submission for a reason. His portion of explaining, I wouldn't -- he's been in finance a long time. This is a very successful individual. He has heard of Ponzi schemes before.

He implies, I wouldn't just give anyone a job. I wouldn't give anyone a second chance. I give it to Mr. Park because I know who she is and I can see what happened here and I can see how important it is to her and to the victims that she make restitution.

I don't think it is fair in any way for the government to suggest that this is buying her way out of prison. There is a statute, your Honor. We are required to consider it. If you had someone who might potentially have a job, that is one thing. You have someone who has a job, has already put \$15,000 in three months. There is no reason not to believe it will grow. She is committed to it. I'll talk about financial restitution and what I've called emotional restitution.

I don't think that the government has ever addressed this, never responded to Ms. Park's community service. I started out by pointing out Mr. Stevens in the courtroom. I can't say enough what she did for this organization. It's important for several reasons. One, it helps the court with the impossible task here of looking into this woman's soul and saying, What happened here? Are you really just a fraud and a swindler that I have to put behind bars, or are you a fundamentally good person who lost her way?

Her response to the arrest, your Honor, and not to repeat, it was to sell a home that I said, Hey, let's not sell. To get a job, even though she is sick, and to devote 1100

hours, 1100 hours to an organization that she found online, again, I am not going to read the letters because they're powerful enough the first time you read them.

But Mr. Stevens is a formerly incarcerated individual. He articulates something I couldn't do, and I feel the same way about Mr. Grant and Mr. Ham. They are able to say what I am trying to say much more powerfully because they are so close to it.

He articulates the ability of this woman, if she remains on the outside, to do those things we strive to do, which is not just punishment. It is not just punishment. I will talk about the medical care, your Honor.

We don't even have a form letter from the BOP. The government stands up and says, Well, I spoke to someone and they have no doubt that they can care for her. I have had cases with medical issues before. I have never had a case where the BOP didn't even bother to submit the standard letter that she submits that says, Oh, we can do it. Without that letter, and even if there were that letter, I have a real issue with any confidence that the BOP is going to handle it in the most effective manner.

THE COURT: Do you think it is necessary to adjourn the sentencing and get the letter, or do you take the government's representation that they spoke to the program?

MS. GATTO: I have no reason to believe, and I would

never suggest the government is lying. I know the government spoke to the BOP. They spoke to someone who can't guarantee designations. That is not what they do.

All they have told you about Xolair -- I'll talk about that first, and then all the other conditions -- all they have told you about Xolair is that there is one man somewhere at some point in time with whatever diagnosis, that unknown individual has got Xolair at a facility that she is not going to. No one can guarantee Xolair to her. That is the way it works.

That is why Mr. Weiss' affidavits, I felt compelled to submit, because through him I learned a lot about how the BOP works, a lot about the formulary, about the delay, about the inability to transport people to places. He doesn't say, nor would any BOP person say, she is going to or she is not going to. It is unknown.

Is she going to go into anaphylactic shock in prison?

Maybe. We don't know. Is she going to be able, if she does go into anaphylactic shock, to get the lieutenant to get her

EpiPen? Maybe. Is she going to get the Xolair shots? Maybe.

There will be a delay, there is no question of that. Maybe.

Maybe. Will she be triggered by all the allergens that are there? Probably. What the results will be, who knows. Will her aneurysm rupture in prison? We don't know. Will she be able to get to the doctors she needs to? We don't know, your

Honor.

Again, the statute requires us to look at medical care in the most effective manner. I don't think there can be a dispute, there really cannot be a dispute, that in the most effective manner, those words of the statute are achieved by keeping her on the outside.

Again, your Honor, you already said it is so hard. If we were looking at medical care, there is no question. I think the sentence I'm asking for complies with the statute, if you're just looking at the need for restitution.

But court has to balance it all together, and I'll end where I started, really, in this process. I try to do that. I put on the scales of this balancing system, the boulder that is this offense, and then I stack the rocks that are all the mitigation here, your Honor, her medical issues, the fact that she is about to have a baby. It is really a miracle child at 41 years old. A newborn who is about to enter this world on August 29, and what it will be like for this woman and for the government to suggest that separating a newborn baby from its mother is the same as separating a newborn baby from its father, I think, really flies in common sense.

THE COURT: There are a lot of genuinely heart-breaking things about this case, which is what makes it so hard, right?

MS. GATTO: That's right, your Honor. That is right.

THE COURT: Both for Ms. Park and for the victims.

MS. GATTO: It's a tragic, tragic case, your Honor.

All we can ground ourselves in is what is a long or any prison sentence doing here? How can we make this less tragic?

The financial loss can be somewhat diminished by her ability to work, her remorse, her community service, her rehabilitation, her personal journey, her medical care, her relationship with this newborn on the outside, with still very punitive consequences, your Honor.

Again, I would have written every alternative to incarceration in my submission if I could think of it. 30,000 hours of community service over ten years, she is going to do that either way. I offered this because I know there is a way to fashion a sentence that deals with that boulder on the other side, but also deals with much bigger than that boulder on this side. It is punitive house arrest. If the court considers a longer period, I don't think we would take any position. We are just trying to balance it all in what is a very tragic case.

I am not going to say anything else unless the court has questions. I have nothing else to say. I really rely on Mr. Ham and Mr. Grant, who I think articulated what I have been trying to articulate in hundreds of pages of writing in this case and in my advocacy here that prison is too much, not necessary, and there is a way we can do this the right way,

your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Park, is there anything you would like to say today?

You can stay seated if you would like, just move the microphone closer, please.

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, can she go to the podium?
THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I appear before you today ready to accept the consequences of my action, which have devastated the people I care about most in this world. My downward spiral into this crime began with a dream of forming my own company and bettering the lives, financial lives, of my loved ones and myself. When I ran into problems and made mistakes, I began to make all the wrong decisions.

What started as one lie of omission turned into what I thought would be a temporary misreporting of numbers, and then it eventually snowballed into a monstrous web of lies that I could no longer untangle. All along I focused on one thought and one thought only, that I could not and would not lose these people's money. Failure was not an option.

I had made promises to the people I loved, and it was my responsibility to fix my own mistakes. I imagined what the loss would mean for each person and could not let myself walk away. Worst of all, worst of all, I thought that I had a

fighting chance to make it all back. By the end, I was lying to give myself time to consider my risky, incredibly foolish bets, lying to stall people from withdrawing money, and lying to solicit more money to fund the withdrawals.

I continued to justify these terrible acts in my own head by repeating to myself constantly that I'll turn the losses into gains and pay all these people back once everything got back on track. What I should have chosen to do from the very beginning was to admit my initial mistakes with humility and honesty. I should have reached out for help instead of isolating myself further.

Instead, I committed a terrible, terrible act that is, at best, a product of unbelievable hubris and cowardice and, at worst, monstrosity. What I initially thought was an act to remedy my mistakes and not cause harm morphed into a betrayal of the worst kind, that inflicted damages that ended up being matters worse than my initial mistakes would have been.

My heart crumbles every day thinking about the devastation and difficulties each of my friends and family is going through because of what I have done. I lie awake every night thinking about the retirement money, the college fund, the future plans and dreams that are now in jeopardy and damaged because of what I did to these hard-working people that trusted my education, my work experience, and above all, my integrity.

Over the past year, I apologized over and over again in my head to each person, all the while knowing that no amount of apology would make a difference. They did not deserve to be hit with this disaster and betrayal. They deserve their hard-earned money. They deserved honesty and truth so they could have made informed decisions.

For many months, I wanted to end my own life because I didn't know how I could possibly live with the guilt of having caused so much irreparable damage to so many people's lives. But that would have been the ultimate act of cowardice. The only choice now that I have is to face the consequences and do everything in my power to redress the harm in any way that I can.

The painful truth, though, is that there is an emotional scar that many of my victims will not be able to erase for a long time, if ever, no matter how much of their money they get back. Still, I will live each day doing my best to repair the damage and atone for what I have done. I will live to teach our unborn child that it is never wrong to admit one's mistakes and failures, and in doing so is the very definition of courage.

Lastly, I would like to apologize to the victims who are suffering every day from the financial and emotional injury that I caused. You are each someone or a friend of someone I loved like family. I am so ashamed and truly sorry for all the

lies and pains I caused you. I imagine you questioning every meaningful moment of friendship and love we shared over the months and years we have known each other, and I can't blame you for thinking that every word and action from me must have been a lie after what you have been through for the past year. There is probably no way for me to help you make sense of my actions, given that you are people I truly loved and cared for. I am so sorry. I truly wish there were something I could do to undue the harm.

There is some of you who have shown incredible mercy and generosity of spirit in forgiving me, even after seeing me in my most broken and ugliest moments. You have forgiven what I cannot forgive in myself. It is a debt, it is a debt that I can never repay, but I will work to pay it forward for as long as I live.

Your Honor, I know that no amount of remorse or restitution will erase the harm I caused these people, but I will put my best foot forward each day, live the remaining days of my life with integrity, and accept the course of justice prescribed by this court respectfully.

Thank you for allowing me this time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'm going to just take a very short break. I am going to ask you to stay where you are because I won't be long.

Thank you.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Is there any reason why sentence cannot be imposed at this time?

MS. MAGDO: Not that the government is aware of, your Honor.

MS. GATTO: No.

THE COURT: I'm required to consider the advisory guidelines range of 108 to 120 months, as well as various other factors that are outlined in a provision of the law. It is Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a). I have done so.

Those factors -- and I am supposed to consider all of them -- include but are not limited to the nature and circumstances of the offense, the personal history and characteristics of the defendant, because each defendant must be considered individually as a person and as a human being, Mr. Grant, as you very rightly and pointedly noted. Judges are also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, and to protect the public from future crimes, as well as to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among other factors.

As I said earlier, this is extraordinarily difficult.

As I think we all recognize, on one hand, Ms. Park, you have

hurt so many people, good people, people you loved most in the

world. And, frankly, I read every page of the very stellar submission your lawyer drafted on your behalf. I listened to you here today, and I still don't totally understand how you could do that, how you could lie and steal from those you love and those who trusted you day in and day out — relatives, close friends, former classmates — and for so many years. For over six years you defrauded more than 40 individuals of \$23 million. That's staggering, frankly.

One of the things that I think was especially egregious is that you continued to seek out more money and more investors through charm and manipulation and personal relationships, knowing full well that it was all built on a lie and that you were putting each of these victims' lives in jeopardy in the process. I can understand the shame, the fear of failure, the desperate hope that you would make the money back, but for those desires to be so much more important to you than the life savings and the emotional stability and security of these people, it was selfish, it was arrogant, it was careless, and callous and cruel.

And while we can calculate the harm in dollars, for some, that harm is immeasurable. The loss of livelihood, of savings, of college funds, the precious fruits of hard labor from your victims, that they had hoped to pass on to their children and their grandchildren. For one victim, you stole the stability that he had worked for over 50 years to build,

and the peace that he expected to have at the age of 75 that he no longer has.

From another, the government cited his letter, who is wheelchair bound writes that you stole not only \$4 million intending to pay for medical care, but left a permanent devastation that is physical, emotional, spiritual and psychological.

Many others have described the devastating loss not only of financial security, but the loss of dignity and trust in others, and you caused all of that. And whether it is out of hubris or confidence or arrogance, you caused it. And unlike so many people I see sit in that seat you're sitting in, you are not someone without opportunity or without support. To the contrary, you had a Harvard education. You have a plethora of people who love you and who support you. So you have more options in life than just about anyone I've seen sit in that seat. Yet, you squandered all of those opportunities.

So I do think a very substantial sentence needs to be imposed in light of the gravity of these crimes, to provide just punishment, to afford adequate deterrence to others who may be intended to engage in similar conduct. There will be serious consequences for conduct like this.

I have also, though, considered all the arguments that you have made, your intent, that you didn't intend to hurt anybody, you intended to pay all of the money back, you didn't

commit the crime out of greed, and I believed that you were genuinely remorseful. I have read all of the letters that were submitted on behalf of your loved ones, who were victims yourself. I heard Mr. Ham, your husband, and Mr. Grant today, speak so eloquently and heard them plead for leniency on your behalf. And the generosity of spirit that I have seen among your loved ones is, frankly, inspiring. And that there are so many people who are willing to do so, to forgive and to plead for leniency on your behalf, says a lot about the devotion that they have to you.

And Mr. Grant and Mr. Ham and all of the other victims who have urged leniency, I want to tell you, I have heard your voices. I have heard the other victims as well, but I have heard your voices too. And it is all part of this very difficult balance that I am trying to achieve here today.

I have considered your argument regarding the fraud guidelines, and I am mindful that the amount of loss is the principal determinate of the adjusted offense level and, hence, the corresponding sentencing range. I agree with Ms. Park that, in many instances, loss amount on the own is an imprecise and imperfect measure of culpability, but here, as I noted earlier, we don't have a one-time scheme with a loss amount, a large loss amount or something like that, but we have a fraud that was perpetrated day in and day out over years in a meticulous and intentional manner against so many trusting

victims.

I have considered as well your community service and the importance of you getting back to work so that you can pay your restitution. I have considered the various medical conditions. With respect to the brain aneurysm, I understand that the embolization appears to have been successful for now, but that you need to continue to be screened and surgery may be necessary in the future. With respect to your severe asthma and other health conditions, I am persuaded by the government's representation that, based on its investigation and conversations with BOP representatives, that the BOP has medical facilities, including the Federal Medical Center Carswell in Fort Worth, Texas, that can adequately address medical needs, although I will say that I am happy to make any kind of recommendation with respect to medical care.

Finally, I have considered that you're due to have a baby shortly and that being separated from him will be a punishment like no other. So, in sum, while I think that some variance is appropriate in light of your health and your personal issues and some of the other sentencing factors, I have ultimately come to the conclusion that I do think that a significant prison sentence is necessary given the enormity of the crime and the cold and calculating manner in which it was carried out, as well as the financial and emotional harm due to so many.

I am going to ask you to rise for the imposition of sentence.

It is the judgment of this court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 36 months, to be followed by a term of supervised release of three years. In my view, this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in the law.

In terms of avoiding unwarranted sentencing disparities, I'll note that I do think that there are very specific mitigating factors present in this case that are not present in others.

You can be seated while I describe the conditions of your supervised release, as well as the other details of your sentence.

All the standard conditions of supervision shall apply. The following mandatory conditions shall apply: You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, you must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance, you must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, you must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the court, you must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer, and must make restitution in accordance with the law.

In light of the nature of the crime, I am also going to follow the recommendation of the probation department and impose the following special conditions: That you provide the probation officer with access to requested financial information while you're on supervised release, not incur any new credit card charges or open lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you're in compliance with the installment payment schedule, and that you be supervised in the district of your residence.

I decline to impose a fine in light of the restitution and forfeiture obligations I intend to impose. I am required to impose a mandatory special assessment of \$100, and I do so. I understand that you and the government have agreed to restitution in the amount of no less than \$20,344,010, representing the net loss to any victims, but that the government intends to submit a proposed restitution order with names of the victims within 90 days, is that correct?

MS. MAGDO: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: What would you propose with respect to the timing of the restitution payments, the payment schedule? Is that something you intend to submit as well?

MS. MAGDO: Yes. I can include that in the submission, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Pursuant to the consent order of forfeiture money judgment signed back in January, I am also

entering a money judgment against you in the amount of \$23,186,860, representing the amount of money illicitly taken by you, and the forfeiture of all property which constitutes or is derived from the offense on June 16. A final order of forfeiture as to specific properties was filed. I am going to incorporate those two documents into the judgment.

With respect to the payment schedule for forfeiture, is there any recommendation from the government?

MS. MAGDO: Your Honor, the specific property has already been forfeited, as your Honor is aware. If I may include that with the restitution payment proposal?

THE COURT: Is there any objection to that?

MS. GATTO: No.

THE COURT: If necessary, I'll amend the judgment to include that.

Before reading your appellate rights, I want to discuss a surrender date. Of course I am going to have that surrender date, which the government has suggested, as appropriate as well after the baby is born.

MS. GATTO: Judge, I was going to make a proposal. I don't know if it is possible that we come back three months after the baby is born. At that point, Ms. Park will see what, if any, nursing needs she has for the baby and also the state of her brain aneurysm, and set the surrender date three months after the birth of her son. And then the idea would be, we

would prepare to ask for either, whether it be six weeks or 1 three months or something reasonable, but --2 3 THE COURT: Does the government have any objection to 4 that? 5 MS. MAGDO: No. Although, I believe Ms. Gatto may have misspoken. I think she said set the next hearing, not the 6 7 surrender date for three months. 8 THE COURT: I think she said actually set the 9 surrender date. 10 MS. GATTO: Your Honor, that would give me an 11 opportunity, to the extent we can, work with the BOP to figure 12 out how to set up medical needs before. It is not an easy 13 process, because we don't even know where she is going. It 14 would give us a little --15 THE COURT: I'll do that. Why don't we set a date 16 now. 17 The baby is due in September, but when exactly? 18 MS. GATTO: The baby, there is a scheduled C-section 19 on August 29. I thought the end of November. 20 THE COURT: Why don't we set a conference for that 21 date. Why don't we set a conference date for November 29 at 22 9:30. 23 Thank you. MS. GATTO: 24 THE COURT: At that time, I do want both the parties

to be up on all of the medical issues, and I do expect that

25

2.2

Ms. Park will have child care, to the extent consistent with her husband's work schedule, in place at that time and will set a surrender date at that time.

That is the sentence of this court. Ms. Park, you have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence, except to whatever extent you may have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement. If you do choose to appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you're not able to pay for the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, which simply means that court costs and filing fees will be waived. If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Does the government move to dismiss the open counts against Ms. Park?

MS. MAGDO: The government so moves.

MS. GATTO: Your Honor, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: It will be dismissed.

MS. GATTO: One more comment.

Can you waive interest on the restitution? I think it is 20-something million dollars. The interest shouldn't be the concern.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. MAGDO: No.

THE COURT: I'll do that.

Thank you. We are adjourned.

I want to thank, again, all the victims, both

Ms. Olsen, if you can pass that along to the victims who

submitted letters and to those who came here today. It was

very important to me to hear perspectives from all sides. I

know that this is an emotional case and has been for everybody

involved, but I want to thank you all for writing and speaking

and sharing your thoughts and feelings with me.

We are adjourned.

10 000